



# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt  
Governor

Robert L. Morgan  
Executive Director

Lowell P. Braxton  
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210

PO Box 145801

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

(801) 538-5340 telephone


(801) 359-3940 fax

(801) 538-7223 TTY

www.nr.utah.gov

July 17, 2002

TO: Minerals File

FROM: Paul Baker, Reclamation Biologist 

RE: Site Inspection, Robert L. Clark, Clark #1 Mine, S/015/053, Emery County, Utah

Date of Inspection: June 7, 2002  
Time of Inspection: 10:00 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.  
Conditions: Clear, 80's  
Participants: Val Payne, Emery County Public Lands Council; Bret Miller; Dean Nyffeler and Tom Rasmussen, BLM; Paul Baker, DOGM

### Purpose of Inspection:

Our purpose was to confirm observations made on May 9, 2002, by personnel from the state office of the Bureau of Land Management.

### Getting to the site:

Take 300 East in Emery south for about one mile. Follow the paved road as it veers to the left (southeast). A little before this road goes into Miller Canyon, there is a dirt road leading south. Take this road to where it dead ends at the Bret Clark Mine. Robert Clark's mine is an underground mine between the mines operated by T. J. and Bret Clark.

### Observations:

This mine has the smallest disturbance of the three brothers' mines in this area. There is a road going down to a pad where there are, as I recall, two portals, one of which is shown in Photo 3 on the attachment to this report. It appears it would be possible to gain entry to the mine through the fence across this portal. The portal needs to be secured.

The report about the May 9 inspection by the Bureau of Land Management indicates there appeared to be an unsecured area where explosives may be stored or present with a shot wire leading into a portal with an explosives sign on it. The only wire we found at any of the mine portals in the three mines in the vicinity appeared to be a communication wire.

Page 2

Robert L. Clark, Clark #1 Mine

S/015/053

July 17, 2002

There was an explosives magazine on site. It was locked and grounded, but we do not know whether there was anything in it.

Photo 1 shows a pile of trash or scrap that needs to be cleaned up.

Photo 4 shows the outslope of the portal pad and a breach in the berm.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations:**

The operator needs to secure the portal. This needs to be done as soon as possible. There should also be signs alerting the public to any hazards.

The operator needs to rebuild the berm both to control runoff and for safety. According to MSHA regulations, the berm should be at least as high as the axle of the largest equipment used at the site.

Any trash or scrap needs to be disposed of or recycled, and equipment should be stored neatly in a consolidated manner.

If the explosives magazine contains explosives, it needs to be kept where it is not accessible to the public. There also needs to be a sign to warn of the danger. There are probably additional MSHA and Bureau of Land Management requirements for storing explosives.

The memorandum from the BLM says the operator should reclaim portions of the operation that are no longer being used. Division regulations require that reclamation occur concurrently with mining operations to the extent feasible. If portions of the operation will no longer be used, they should be reclaimed.

The BLM and the Division have three notices for mining in this area, and the memo from the BLM indicates one plan of operations would be appropriate since there is only one project area. Although all three of these operations are conducted adjacent to each other, they are separate. According to Bret Clark, the underground workings are not connected. The operations' boundaries are reasonably clear although it would be better if the actual boundaries and limits of responsibility could be agreed upon and marked with t-posts or similar markers in the field. We did not discuss this while on site, but I feel it would help to avoid confusion and misunderstandings in the future.

Other issues noted in the inspection report from the BLM personnel are:

1. Workings unsafe because the operator has undermined the cliff face. This issue is beyond the purview of the Division and should be addressed by the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

Page 3

Robert L. Clark, Clark #1 Mine

S/015/053

July 17, 2002

2. The BLM noted that it appears no topsoil was salvaged, but this is because the site was disturbed prior to any requirements for topsoil salvage. If any new areas are disturbed, the operator should salvage soil.
3. Several 55-gallon drums and 5-gallon containers. We did not see these containers on this mine site although they were on one of the adjacent mines.

jb

cc:

Robert L. Clark

Dean Nyffeler, Price BLM

Val Payne, Emery County Public Lands Council

O:\M015-Emery\Clark\final\ins060702tjclark.doc



**ATTACHMENT**

**Photographs**

**S/015/053**

**Robert Clark, Clark #1 Mine**



Photo 1. Trash or scrap that needs to be cleaned up.



Photo 2. Road leading to the portals. The product stockpile associated with Bret Clark's mine is on top of the hill in the distance.





Photo 3. Portal that needs to be secured.



Photo 4. Breach in the berm on the pad outslope.